UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/590,197  | 11/27/2007  | Arnaud Huignard      | 294729US0PCT         | 5542             |  |
| OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET |             |                      | EXAMINER             |                  |  |
|   |             |                      | WIECZOREK, MICHAEL P |                  |  |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314  |             |                      | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|   |             |                      | 1712                 |                  |  |
|   |             |                      |                      |                  |  |
|   |             |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE    | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|   |             |                      | 10/27/2011           | ELECTRONIC       |  |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)    |  |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/590,197      | HUIGNARD ET AL. |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit        |  |
|                 | I .             |  |

|   | Michael Wieczorek   | 1712   |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appea  | rs on the cover sheet with the  | correspondence add   | ress  |
| THE REPLY FILED 18 October 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF  | PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOI   | R ALLOWANCE.   |   |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the following places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:  | ng replies: (1) an amendment, af<br>ce of Appeal (with appeal fee) in   | fidavit, or other eviden<br>compliance with 37 Cl                                    | ce, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3)                                 |
| <ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this Acono event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late.</li> <li>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b)</li> </ul>  | lvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth<br>er than SIX MONTHS from the mailin   | g date of the final rejection  | on.   |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the state forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later 1 may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 5.07(f).  n which the petition under 37 CFR 1.  ension and the corresponding amount  nortened statutory period for reply orig | 136(a) and the appropria<br>of the fee. The appropri<br>inally set in the final Offi | te extension fee<br>ate extension fee<br>ce action; or (2) as |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL  | " 07.0ED 44.07  | en 1 2012 i iii  |   |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl<br/>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten<br/>a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed to<br/>AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>   | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to  | avoid dismissal of th  | e appeal. Since   |
| 3. 🛮 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b   | ut prior to the date of filing a brief  | , will <u>not</u> be entered be  | ecause  |
| (a) $\boxtimes$ They raise new issues that would require further con (b) $\square$ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below   | sideration and/or search (see NC<br>/);   | TE below);   |   |
| <ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c</li> </ul>   |   |  | the issues for  |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11  |   | jootoa olaimio.  |   |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  | 1. See attached Notice of Non-Co  | ompliant Amendment   | (PTOL-324).   |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alk non-allowable claim(s).  | ·   | •  | -   |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 30-48. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |   | ill be entered and an e  | explanation of  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |   |  |   |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   |   |  |   |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a<br>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov<br>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary  | rercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe  | al and/or appellant fai  | ls to provide a   |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation<br>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   | of the status of the claims after e   | entry is below or attach   | ned.  |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.   | does NOT place the application i  | n condition for allowar  | nce because:  |
| <ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (l</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>   | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)  |  |   |
| /Michael Wieczorek/<br>Examiner, Art Unit 1712  | /Frederick J. Parker/<br>Primary Examiner, Art U  | nit 1715   |   |
|   |   |  |   |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: 1. The amended claims will not be entered because the new limitations within parent claim 30 requiring that the sublayer is specifically silicon dioxide and that the activated surface of the etched sublayer has an RMS roughness of from a few nm to 30 nm alters the scope of the claims and thus would require further search and/or consideration. Furthermore, the applicant is advised that the new limitation of the RMS roughness being from a few nm to 30 would be rejected as being indefinite under 112 2nd paragraphs because the term "a few nm" is a relative term because the term is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments concerning the combination of Uemura and Okudaria are not persuasive because as was discussed in the previous Office Action Okudaria teaches known gases in the art for plasma etching of silicon dioxide layers as required by the method of Uemura. The fact that Okudaria etches an entire portion of the silicon dioxide layer had been removed by etching has not bearing on the combination with Uemura because Uemura teaches just etching the surface of the silicon dioxide sublayer to roughen the layer. Following the teachings of Uemura one of ordinary skill in the art would only perform the plasma treatment for a long enough period of time to only roughen the sublayer surface and not completely remove it. Furthermore, applicant's "unexpected" results presented within the specification are not persuasive because these results are not commensurate with the scope of the claims because the obtained results were only obtained for C2F6 while the amended and unentrered claims are for plasmas formed from either C2F6 of CF4.